

Panaji, 7th January, 2010 (Pausa 17, 1931)

SERIES II No. 41

# OFFICIAL GAZETTE

## GOVERNMENT OF GOA

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

*Note:- There is one Extraordinary issue to the Official Gazette, Series II No. 40 dated 1-1-2010 from pages 1037 to 1038 regarding Notification from Goa Legislature Secretariat.*

### GOVERNMENT OF GOA

#### Department of Agriculture

Directorate of Agriculture

#### Corrigendum

No. 2/14/95/AGR-II/313

Read: 1) Government order No. 2/14/95/AGR-II/292 dated 18-12-2009.

The above referred Order may be read as below:-

- 1) Order referred at Read 1 be read as No. 2/14/95/AGR-II/285 dated 7-12-2009 instead of "No. 2/14/95/AGR-II/dated 7-12-2009".
- 2) Order referred at Read 2 be read as No. 2/14/95/AGR-II/286 dated 8-12-2009" instead of "No 2/14/95/AGR-II/dated 8-12-2009".

*S. S. P. Tendulkar*, Director of Agriculture & ex officio Jt. Secretary.

Tonca-Caranzalem, 28th December, 2009.

#### Department of Education, Art & Culture

Directorate of Higher Education

#### Order

No. 22/7/91-EDN/3721

Read: Order No. 22/7/91-Edn/2748 dated 24-12-2008.

In continuation of the Order read as above, Government is pleased to grant extension in the

lien period of Dr. Purva G. Hegde Desai, Lecturer in Commerce, Government College of Arts, Science and Commerce, Quepem-Goa, for a further period of one year i.e. 2nd year w.e.f. 1-1-2010 to 31-12-2010.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*R. K. Halarnkar*, Under Secretary (Higher Education).

Panaji, 29th December, 2009.

Directorate of Art and Culture

#### Order

No. DAC/6-IV/BC-BB/AA/2009/3730

Government of Goa is pleased to constitute a Committee for designing of the special postal cover with mission and special cancellation stamp in memory of two eminent personalities i.e. 1) The 1st Chief Minister of Goa, Late Dayanand alias Bhausahab Bandodkar and 2) Late Bakibab Borkar, Author of repute, consisting of following members:

- |  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
| 1. Director of Art & Culture, Panaji                 | Chairman.         |
| 2. Principal of Goa College of Art, Altinho-Panaji   | Member.           |
| 3. Shri Shridhar Kamat Bambolkar, Bandivade, Ponda   | Member.           |
| 4. Shri Sadguru Chendwankar, Sangolda, Bardez        | Member.           |
| 5. Shri V. R. Navelkar, Devlai, Khandola, Marcel-Goa | Member.           |
| 6. Curator, Central Library, Panaji                  | Member Secretary. |

The Committee shall look after designing of the special Postal Cover, formulate the message for the mission to be imprinted on the special postal cover

and prepare the design for the special cancellation metal stamp.

The Committee shall meet as and when required to discuss the matter and issues related to the designing of the postal cover and stamp.

The non-official members shall be entitled for TA/DA as per the Government rules.

The Committee shall cease to exist on successful completion of the aforesaid assignment.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Prasad Lolayekar*, Director of Art & Culture & ex officio Jt. Secretary.

Panaji, 22nd December, 2009.

## Department of Finance

Directorate of Accounts

### Order

No. DA/Admn/45-6/09-10/TR-3815/113

On repatriation to the parent cadre from the Mapusa Municipal Council, Mapusa, the Government is pleased to order the transfer and posting of Shri Ramchandra L. Mandrekar, Assistant Accounts Officer under Common Accounts Cadre in the office of the River & Navigation Department, Betim, Goa, thereby relieving Shri Sadashiv Govekar, Dy. Director of Accounts of additional duties.

On joining the new assignments, the Officers shall send CTC/Joining Report to this Directorate.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Pramod Y. Ramani*, Director of Accounts.

Panaji, 30th December, 2009.

## Department of Home

Home—General Division

### Order

No. 2/87/2009-HD(G)

Advocate, Shri Gurunath V. Dhume is hereby appointed as Special Public Prosecutor under

sub-section (8) of Section 24 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Central Act 2 of 1974) as amended by Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Act, 2005 for the purpose of conducting Case No. 187/S/06/C, of Porvorim P. S. Cr. No. 15/2005 U/S 193-201, 465 468, 469, 471 r/w 120-B IPC, presently pending in the court of JMFC 'C' Court, Mapusa, on the terms and conditions specified in the Order.

He is sanctioned professional fees at the rate of Rs. 1,500/- per effective hearing of the case, Rs. 750/- per non-effective hearing and Rs. 300/- per Miscellaneous Application.

Further that he is put under the Administrative Control of Director of Prosecution and should keep the Director informed of the case proceedings from time to time.

The expenditure shall be debited to the Budget Head 2014—Admn. of Justice, 00, 114—Legal Adviser & Counsels, 01—Public Prosecutor (North Goa), 14—Professional and Special Services.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Sidhivinayak Surendra Naik*, Under Secretary (Home).

Porvorim, 24th December, 2009.

## Department of Labour

### Order

No. 28/31/2009-LAB

Whereas the Government of Goa is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the management of M/s. Bogmalo Beach Resort, Bogmalo, Goa and its workman, Shri Manuel D'Cruz, in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said dispute");

And whereas the Government of Goa considers it expedient to refer the said dispute for adjudication.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947) (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act"), the Government of Goa hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal of Goa at Panaji-Goa, constituted under Section 7-A of the said Act.

## SCHEDULE

“(1) Whether Shri Manuel D'Cruz, Assistant Manager, can be construed as “workman” as per clause (s) of Section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947)?

(2) If the answer to the issue No. (1) above is in the affirmative, then, whether the action of the management of M/s. Bogmallo Beach Resort, Bogmalo, Goa in terminating the services of Shri Manuel D'Curz, Assistant Manager, with effect from 02-02-2009, is legal and justified?

(3) If the answer to issue No. (2) above is in the negative, then, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*B. S. Kudalkar*, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 22nd December, 2009.

## Notification

No. 24/15/2003-LAB

Read: Government Notification No. 24/15/2003-LAB/1768 dated 26-12-2008, published in the Official Gazette, Series II No. 40 dated 1st January, 2009.

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 87 of the Employees State Insurance Act, 1948 (Central Act 34 of 1948) (hereinafter referred to as the “said Act”) and all other powers enabling it in this behalf, the Government of Goa hereby exempts the Goa Labour Recruitment and Employment Society, Panaji, Goa from the operation of the said Act, for a further period of one year with effect from 26-12-2009.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*B. S. Kudalkar*, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 22nd December, 2009.

## Notification

No. 28/1/2009-LAB

The following award passed by the Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court-I, at Panaji-Goa on 23-11-2009 in reference No. IT/103/99 is hereby published as required by Section 17 of the

Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By Order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*B. S. Kudalkar*, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 14th December, 2009.

IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL  
AND LABOUR COURT  
GOVERNMENT OF GOA  
AT PANAJI

(Before Smt. Anuja Prabhudessai, Hon'ble  
Presiding Officer)

Ref. IT/103/99

Shri Yeshwant Hari Velingkar,  
at Veling,

P. O. Mardol,

Veling, Goa. 403 404.

V/s

M/s Mohan Travels,

517, E-Pune Bangalore Road,

Kolhapur, 461 001.

... Workman/Party I

... Employer/Party II

Party I/Workman represented by Adv. P. J. Kamat.

Party II/Employer represented by Adv. M. S. Bandonkar.

## AWARD

(Passed on this 23rd day of November, 2009)

1. By order dated 3-9-99 the Government of Goa, in exercise of powers conferred under Clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Act, 1947, has referred to this Industrial Tribunal the following dispute for adjudication—

“1. Whether the action of the management of M/s. Mohan Travels, Kolhapur, Maharashtra, in terminating the services of Shri Yeshwant Hari Velingkar, Clerk, Branch Panaji, Goa Office, with effect from 1-11-97, is legal and justified?

2. If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?”

2. On receipt of the reference, IT/103/99 was registered. Notices were issued to both parties, pursuant to which the Party I filed his claim statement at Exb. 3 and the Party II filed its written statement at Exb. 5. The rejoinder of the Party I is at Exb. 6.

3. The Party I was employed with the Party II as a bus attendant. He was promoted as Clerk.

The party I has stated that besides Goa the Party II has its branch at Bombay-Pune-Bangalore-Aurangabad-Nasik-Ratnagiri-Ahmednagar and it has its head office at Kolhapur. The Party I has stated that it was understood and agreed that his appointment was only for Goa region and as such no Clause relating to transfer was inserted in the promotion letter dated 4-10-95. The party I has stated that sometime in the month of July 1997 he was instructed to attend office at Kolhapur and when he went to Kolhapur he was told that in appreciation of his sincere efforts and keen interest in the jobs assigned to him his services would be utilized at Bombay office. The Party I has stated that he declined to accept the transfer order as it was difficult to accommodate in Bombay with meagre increase in the salary which was offered. Hence, he returned to Goa and continued to work in Panjim office at Goa.

4. The Party I has stated that on 20-9-97 he received a letter stating that he did not report for work from 1-8-97. He denied the said allegations vide letter dated 3-10-97. In reply to the said letter dated 3-10-97 the Party II, vide its letter dated 10-10-97 contended that on account of the closure of the establishment at Goa his services were retrenched and the legal formalities would be completed in short time. Thereafter, by letter dated 14-10-97 the Party II informed him that because of closure of Panaji branch his services would not be required from the expiry of one month from 1-10-97. Vide letter dated 25-10-97 the Party II sent a demand draft for Rs. 4,342/- towards retrenchment compensation.

5. The Party I stated that his services could not have been retrenched with retrospective effect. The Party I has stated that the Party II neither issued any notice nor paid retrenchment compensation as required under Section 25F of the Act. The Party I has further stated that the Party II is an industrial establishment having more than 100 workmen working at its different branches. The Party I has stated that the closure was in contravention of Section 25(o) of the Act and the same is null, void and non-est. The Party I has therefore sought reinstatement with full back wages and continuity in service.

6. The Party II has stated that the services of the Party I were terminated because of closure of the establishment and hence the reference, which has arisen out of the closure of the establishment, is bad in law and not maintainable. The Party II has denied that it is an "industrial establishment" and that it has employed more than 100 employees

in its branches. The Party II has denied that it is repairing vehicles. The Party II has stated that the services of the Party I were transferable. The Party I has stated that its office at Panjim was closed down as the bus operation at Panjim-Pune route was uneconomical. The Party II has further stated that in view of the closure of the Panjim office the staff was offered job at its establishment at Bombay or Kolhapur. The Party II has stated that the Party I had not accepted the offer of employment at Kolhapur but had agreed to work at Bombay office. In view of which a transfer order was issued to the Party I. The Party I was required to report to Bombay office with effect from 1-8-97. The Party II has stated that the Party I did not join the Bombay office despite accepting the transfer order. The Party II has stated that it has closed its establishment at Panaji and since the Party I did not join Bombay office, it retrenched the services of the Party I. The Party II has stated that the legal dues were paid to the Party I. The Party II has further stated that since it has not engaged 100 workers in its establishment and as such, the provisions of Section 25(o) are not applicable. The Party II has denied that the termination of the Party I is illegal and void.

7. Based on the aforesaid pleadings following issues were framed.

1. Whether the Party I proves that the closure of the establishment of the Party II in Goa is illegal and null and void being in violation of the provisions of Chapter V B of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947?
2. Whether the Party I proves that termination of his service by the Party II is in violation of the provisions of Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947?
3. Whether the Party I proves that the action of the Party II in terminating his service w.e.f. 1-11-97 is illegal and unjustified?
4. Whether the Party II proves that the reference is bad in law and not maintainable and hence is liable to be rejected ?
5. Whether the Party I is entitled to any relief ?
6. What Award ?

8. Learned advocate, Shri P. J. Kamat argued on behalf of the Party I and Adv., Shri Bhandekar argued on behalf of the Party II. I have perused the records and considered the arguments and my findings on the aforesaid issues are as under.



9. *Issue No. 1:* It is not in dispute that Party I was employed as a Clerk in Party II establishment at Panaji. The appointment letter at Exb. E-1 indicates that the Party I was initially appointed as a Bus Attendant with effect from 1-2-93 by order dated 4-10-95 at Exb. W-1. The Party I was promoted as a Clerk with effect from 1-8-95. It is also not in dispute that the Party I was in continuous services of the Party II from the date of his appointment till the date of his termination of his services. The Party II had terminated the services of the Party I on the ground of closure of the establishment/office at Panjim. The Party I has admitted in his cross examination that the Party II had closed the passenger services at Bombay-Goa and Goa-Pune route on 31-5-97. The Party I has challenged the closure on the ground of contravention of Chapter VB of Industrial Dispute Act, 1947. It may be mentioned that the provisions of Chapter VB of the Act are applicable only to those 'Industrial Establishment' in which one hundred or more employees are employed on an average per working day for the preceding twelve months. The term 'Industrial establishment' as defined u/s 25L means.

- (i) a factory as defined in clause (m) of Section 2 of the Factories Act, 1948 (63 of 1948);
- (ii) a mine as defined in clause (j) of sub-section (1) of Section 2 of the Mines Act, 1952 (35 of 1952); or
- (iii) a plantation as defined in clause (f) of section 2 of the Plantations Labour Act, 1951 (69 of 1951).

10. It is not in dispute that the Party II establishment is not a Mine or Plantation within the meaning of Section 2(1)(j) of Mines Act or Section 2(f) of the Plantations Labour Act. The question is whether Party II establishment is a factory within the meaning of Section 2(m) of the Factories Act, 1948. Section 2(m) of Factories Act defines Factory as under;

- (i) *whereon ten or more workers are working, or were working on any day of the preceding twelve months, and in any part of which a manufacturing process is being carried on with the aid of power, or is ordinarily so carried on, or*
- (ii) *whereon twenty or more workers are working, or were working on any day of the preceding twelve months, and in any part of which a manufacturing process is being carried on without the aid of power, or is ordinarily so carried on.*

11. It is thus evident that for an establishment to be a factory it should essentially carry out manufacturing process which as defined under Section 2(k) of the Factories Act means any process for

- (i) *making, altering, repairing, ornamenting, finishing, packing, oiling, washing, cleaning, breaking up, demolishing, or otherwise treating or adapting any article or substance with a view to its use, sale, transport, delivery or disposal, or*
- (ii) *pumping oil, water sewage or any other substance; or*
- (iii) *generating, transforming or transmitting power; or*
- (iv) *composing types for printing, printing by letter press, lithography, photogravure or other similar process or book binding or*
- (v) *constructing, reconstructing, repairing, refitting, finishing, or braking up ships or vessels;*
- (vi) *preserving or storing any article in cold storage;*

12. In the instant case, the Party I has claimed that the Party II establishment was carrying on the business of passenger services and was engaged in repairing vehicles. The Party II has not disputed that it is in the business of passenger service. However, Party II has denied that it has workshops wherein it is carrying on the business of repairing vehicles. It may be mentioned that the transport business does not per se come within the purview of the definition manufacturing process. Hence it was necessary for the Party I to prove that the Party II is also engaged in the business of repairing vehicles. In this regard, the Party I Yeshwant Velingkar had deposed that the Party II is carrying on the business of repairing vehicles. In his cross-examination, Party I Yeshwant Velingkar had deposed that the Party II had a workshop at Mercedes wherein the vehicles were being repaired. He has however stated that he does not have any document to prove that the Party II had a workshop at Mercedes. It is to be noted that in the course of the cross-examination the Party I had produced letter at Exb. II colly. These letters do not indicate that the vehicles referred to in the said letter were repaired in the workshop of the Party II. It is also to be noted that the Party I has stated that the garage at Mercedes is known as 'Rawalnath Garage'. He has admitted that the said

garage is owned by Vernekar and that the vehicles of the Party II are taken to the said garage only for washing. The Party II has not adduced any evidence to show the relationship between the Party II establishment and said Vernekar and in the absence of such evidence it cannot be inferred that Party II is the owner of the said garage or that the Party II was carrying on the business of repairing vehicles. This being the case, there is no evidence to prove that the Party II establishment was engaged in 'Manufacturing process'. Consequently, Party II establishment is not a factory within the meaning of the Act.

13. It is also pertinent to note that the Party I has deposed that Party II owned 40 buses and it used to employ over 100 employees in its branches at Bombay, Pune, Bangalore, Aurangabad, Nasik, Goa, Ratnagiri and Ahmednagar. It may be mentioned that one hundred or more employees which were stated to be employed by the Party II were not employed at Goa branch of Party II but were employed at different branches of the Party II. It is therefore necessary to ascertain whether the work force of the other branches could be considered for computation of hundred workmen so as to bring the Party II unit within the definition of 'Industrial Establishment'. It is well settled that the workmen of other branches can be included only if there is functional integrity and interdependency between the Party II and the other branches of the Party II. What would amount to functional integrity is no more res integra in view of the principles laid down by the Apex Court in that respect, in the case of *Isha Steel Treatment, Bombay v/s Association of Engineering Workers Bombay*, reported in 1987 (2) SCC 203. The Apex Court has reiterated the principles laid down in the case of *the workmen of Straw Board Manufacturing Co. Ltd. v/s M/s Straw Board Manufacturing Co. Ltd. (1974) 1 Lab LJ 449*, wherein it was held that unity, supervision and control that existed in respect of the two mills and the fact that the conditions of services of the workmen of the two mills were substantially identical were not by themselves sufficient in the eyes of law to hold that there was functional integrity. The Apex Court has further held that even factors such as having common numbers of Provident Fund Account and Employees State Insurance Account and entering into similar settlements containing similar terms between the Management and the workmen of the two units, are not sufficient to hold that the two units were one and the same notwithstanding the fact that the nature of the business carried on in them was

the same. The most important aspect in the case relating to closure is whether one unit has such componential relation that the closing of one must lead to the closing of the other or the one cannot reasonably exist without the other.

14. The question of functional integrity was also considered by the Bombay High Court in the case of *Yeshwant Chikhalkar and others v/s Killick Nixon Ltd., and others reported in 1999 II CLR 390* and in the case of *Maharashtra General Kamgar Union v/s Indian Gun Industries Ltd., and others*. The Bombay High Court, after considering the decisions of the Apex Court in the case of *Isha Steel (supra)* and *Hindustan Steel Works Construction Ltd. v/s Hindustan Works Construction Ltd. Employees Union Hyderabad and another etc. reported in 1995 I CLR 596*, has held that mere unity of ownership, management and control are not significant as the test of functional integrity and interdependence. It is held that to decide the issue of functional integrity and interdependence the most pertinent and crucial question would be whether closure of one unit would adversely or gravely affect functioning of the other units.

15. In the instant case, it is not in dispute that the Party II was engaged in the business of passenger transport and has branches in several districts of Maharashtra. The evidence of Vijay Kulkarni, which has gone unchallenged, indicates that initially the Party II was plying buses on Panaji-Bombay route. The said route was closed in the year 1995 and since then the Party II started operating buses on Panaji-Pune route. It is not in dispute that only three employees were working at Panaji branch and that Panaji branch of the Party II was closed in the year 1997. The closure of Panaji branch resulted only in discontinuation of transport services from Panaji to Pune and the closure of the said branch did not affect functioning of the other branches of the Party II in any manner whatsoever. This fact is itself sufficient to prove that each of these branches was functioning independently without there being any mutual interdependence. Hence, the inevitable conclusion is that there was no functional integrity between Panaji branch and the other branches of the Party II. This being the case the workmen engaged in other branches cannot be considered for computing the number of employees so as to bring the Party II establishment within the purview of definition 25L of the Act. The Party II establishment is therefore not an Industrial Establishment and hence the provisions of Chapter VB are not applicable and

closure cannot be held to be illegal for contravention of the said provisions. Issue No. 1 is therefore answered in the negative.

16. *Issue No. 2:* The Party I has admitted that after the Party II had decided to close the passenger services in Goa, the Party II had called him at Kolhapur and had offered to transfer him to the Bombay office. The Party I had also received the transfer order at Exb. 16. The Party I has not disputed that he was offered a job at Bombay and that he had not reported for duties at Bombay office.

17. The evidence of Shri Vijay Kulkarni, the Manager of the Party II viz. the letters at Exb. 20 and 23 clearly indicate that the Party II had called upon the Party I to explain as to why he had not joined duties at Bombay office. By letter dated 10-10-97, the Party II informed the Party I that it had closed operation of Panaji-Pune-Panaji bus service w.e.f. 31-8-93 and the Panaji branch would be closed after completing all formalities. The Party I was further informed that in view of his refusal to join duties at Kolhapur/Bombay branch and in view of the closure of Panaji branch, it had no other alternative but to terminate his services. The Party II had forwarded demand draft dated 14-10-97 towards notice pay and the Party I was called upon to collect his dues. By letter dated 25-10-97 (Exb. W-6) the Party II had forwarded retrenchment compensation of Rs. 4,342/- and vide letter dated 28-10-97 (Exb. W-7) the Party II had forwarded demand draft towards final payment of dues.

18. It is thus evident that the services of the Party I were terminated because of closure. The Party I was served with notice of closure and compensation as computed u/s 25F was also offered to the Party I. Be that as it may, the settled proposition as laid down by the Apex Court in the case of *Hathi Singh Manufacturing Co. Ltd., Ahmedabad and others v/s Union of India, Regional Lab Com. AIR 1960 SC 923*, the requirement of paying compensation and issuing notice or wages in lieu thereof under sub-section (1) Section 25FFF "as if the workmen had been retrenched" cannot be placed on the same footing as the requirement u/s 25F. Payment of compensation is not a condition precedent to closure and consequently, non-payment of compensation does not invalidate the termination or the closure. Hence, the issue No. 2 is answered in the negative.

19. *Issue No. 3:* The services of the Party I were terminated because of the closure of Panaji branch of the Party II. As stated earlier, the provisions of Chapter VB are not applicable to Party II

establishment. The closure is real and genuine hence the termination cannot be held to be illegal. Issue No. 3 is therefore answered in the negative.

20. *Issue No. 4:* The Party II has alleged that once the establishment is closed, the dispute relating to legality and justifiability of the closure is not open to judicial scrutiny. It may be mentioned that dispute relating to retrenchment of the workman and closure of establishment has been included in first schedule of the Act in item No. 10 and can be referred to the Tribunal for adjudication. In the instant case the Party I had challenged the legality of his termination on the ground that the closure was in contravention of Chapter VB of the Act. The dispute referred to this Tribunal is not relating to justifiability, bonafides or reasonableness of the closure, but the dispute referred to this Tribunal is relating to the legality and justifiability of the termination of services of the Party I w.e.f. 1-11-97. The dispute referred and raised is an 'Industrial Dispute' and the Tribunal was competent to adjudicate upon the same hence the reference itself cannot be said to be and hence it cannot be gainsaid that the reference is maintainable. It is further to be noted that once it is held that the provisions of Chapter VB are not applicable and the closure is held to be real and genuine the jurisdiction of the Tribunal comes to an end and it cannot question the justifiability, motive or the intention of the Party II in closing the establishment. In the instant case, the closure is held to be genuine and real and the same is not in contravention of the provisions of Chapter VB and as such the termination of the Party I cannot be said to be illegal or unjustified.

Issue No. 4 is answered accordingly.

21. *Issue No. 5:* The services of the Party I workman are terminated because of the closure which is held to be real and genuine. There is no violation of the mandatory provisions of law. The termination of the Party I is not illegal. Hence, the Party I is not entitled for any relief. Issue No. 5 is answered accordingly.

Under the circumstances, and in view of discussion supra, I pass the following order.

Order

The termination of services of the Party I is held to be legal and justified. The Party I is not entitled for any relief. No order as to cost.

Inform the Government accordingly.

Smt. Anuja Prabhudessai,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal,  
& Labour Court.

-----  
**Notification**

No. 28/1/2009-LAB

The following award passed by the Labour Court-II, at Panaji-Goa on 28-10-2009 in reference No. IT/68/07 is hereby published as required by Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947).

By Order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

B. S. Kudalkar, Under Secretary (Labour).

Porvorim, 14th December, 2009.

-----  
**IN THE LABOUR COURT - II  
GOVERNMENT OF GOA  
AT PANAJI**

(Before Shri Suresh N. Narulkar, Hon'ble  
Presiding Officer)

Case No. Ref. IT/68/07

Shri S. S. Dhume,  
House No. 303,  
Sonarbhat, Verem,  
Betim-Goa.

... Workman/Party I

V/s

The Goa Urban Co-operative Bank Ltd.,  
Post Box No. 135,  
Panaji-Goa.

... Employer/Party II

Party I/Workman represented by Adv. V. P. Thali.

Party II/Employer represented by Adv. P. Chawdikar.

Panaji, Dated 28-10-2009.

**AWARD**

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947) the Government of Goa by order dated 25-09-2006 bearing No. 28/34/2006-LAB/662 referred the following dispute for adjudication of this Labour Court.

“(1) Whether Shri S. S. Dhume, Junior Officer, can be construed as a “Workman” as per clause (s) of Section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947)?

(2) If the answer to the issue No. (1) above is in the affirmative, then, whether the action of the Management of the Goa Urban Co-operative Bank Ltd., Panaji, in terminating the services of Shri S. S. Dhume, Junior Officer, with effect from 01-11-2004, is legal and justified?

(3) If the answer to the Issue No. (2) above is in the negative, then, what relief, the workman is entitled to?”

2. On receipt of the reference, a case was registered under No. IT/68/2007 and registered A/D notice was issued to the Parties. In pursuance of the said notice the Parties put in their appearance. The facts of the case in brief as pleaded by the Workman/Party I (for short “Workman”) are that the Employer/Party II (for short “Employer Bank”) is a Multi-State Co-operative Society and registered under Maharashtra Co-operative Societies Act, 1960 under registration No. 3-Bank (b)-1/Goa dated 07-10-1963. The Party-I stated that the Employer Bank is a Multi-State Co-operative Society registered under the Multi-State Co-operative Societies Act, 2002 having its registered Office at Dr. Atmaram Borkar Road, Panaji-Goa. He stated that the Employer Bank has employed approximately 300 workmen in their Bank and about 60 workmen in their Panaji branch. He stated that the Employer Bank is an industry within the meaning of expression “Industry” as used in the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 and is engaged in the banking business. He stated that the Employer Bank is one of the most reputed Bank concern and is well established in its line of business and it has got several branches all over Goa. He stated that he was appointed as a “Clerk” on 28-11-1970 and was posted at Panaji branch. He stated that he was thereafter confirmed as a Clerk on 01-10-1972. He stated that he has been working in the Employer Bank as “Junior Officer” from 06-12-1975 till 01-11-2004 and was confirmed as “Junior Officer” on 08-11-1977. He stated that at the time of termination of his services he was working as a “Junior Officer” and hence he was a Workman within the meaning of expression “Workman” as used in the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. He stated that though he was designated as “Junior Officer”, the work assigned to him was basically that of a clerical nature which consisted



of passing of cheques, checking and verification of accounts and carrying out such other work as was assigned to him by the Branch Manager. He stated that as a "Junior Officer" of the Employer Bank, he had no supervisory or managerial powers nor did he have any authority to sanction leave or to take disciplinary action against any employee of the said Bank. He stated that he had no independent right or authority to take any decision nor in any manner bind the said Bank. He stated that he was not provided with separate cabin. He stated that he had no authority over any of the clerical staff. He stated that he was not responsible for acts and omissions of any other employee. He stated that he on his own could neither represent the Bank nor could enter in any agreement on behalf of the Bank. He stated that the Branch Manager of the Employer Bank addressed a letter dated 09-06-1995 to him regarding fraud in four cases from Dormant Saving Bank Accounts with respect to one Shri Pandurang Naik (S. B. A/c No. 1156), 2. Shri Shashikant M. Naik (S. B. A/c No. 200037) 3. Shri Sitaram S. Naik (S. B. A/c No. 8828) and 4. Ms. Maria V. L. Agustine Cabral and Philomena M. B. Conceisao Alberto (S. B. A/c No. 1334) and sought for detailed explanation from him regarding alleged fraud involved in the said transactions. He stated that he vide his reply dated 05-07-1995 answered the said letter of the Employer Bank dated 09-06-1995. He stated that the Employer Bank vide its letter dated 30-11-1995 transferred him to Curchorem branch and as per the said Transfer Order, he was relieved from Panaji branch on 01-12-1995 and he reported to his new place of posting at Curchorem branch on 04-12-1995. He stated that on 24-01-1996, the Employer Bank issued show cause Notice to him along with a copy of the proceedings of the investigation and the report dated 13-09-1995, thereby alleging the acts of misconduct as spelt out in the service conditions of the Officers of the Bank against him. He stated that the clause VII (A) (b) (III) (XI) (XVII) was mentioned in the said Show Cause Notice and he was required to show cause within 10 days as to why Disciplinary action should not be initiated against him. He stated that the said Show Cause Notice dated 24-01-1996 was replied to by him on 06-02-1996, however without considering his reply dated 06-02-1996, the Employer Bank allegedly in the interest of proper course of enquiry, suspended him in terms of clause VIIB of the Settlement with immediate effect from 16-02-1996 and the said suspension was to be continued pending enquiry and final decision in the matter. He stated that the Employer Bank vide its letter dated 11-03-1996

informed him that they have charged him for certain acts of misconduct and has decided to conduct an enquiry in the said charges against him through Shri Rohit P. Lobo as Enquiry Officer. Accordingly enquiry against him started on 15-04-1996. He stated that he was not paid subsistence allowance from the time he was suspended. He stated that he was not given opportunity to lead evidence before the Enquiry Officer during the said enquiry conducted against him and was also not allowed either to argue orally or to file his Written Arguments in the matter before the Enquiry Officer. He stated that though the Enquiry against him was concluded on 07-12-2000, the Enquiry Officer allowed the Employer Bank to file their Written Arguments within 15 days from 07-12-2000. He stated that thereafter the Employer Bank vide its Show Cause Notice dated 24-08-2004 directed him to show cause within seven days from the receipt of the said notice as to why he should not be dismissed from services. He stated that the said Show Cause Notice of the Employer Bank was replied to by him by his letter dated 05-10-2004. He stated that the Employer Bank vide its letter dated 01-11-2004 addressed to him dismissed him from services with immediate effect. He stated that he has challenged the said alleged illegal termination of his services on the various grounds such as it being illegal, unjustified and untenable in law. He stated that the Enquiry proceedings were conducted against him were clearly in violation of the principles of rules of natural justice and the findings of the Enquiry Officer were perverse and not based on the evidence on record. He stated that he was not provided in advance with the list of witnesses and also list of documents relied upon by the Employer Bank. He submitted that the penalty of termination of service is grossly disproportionate to the charges on which the termination is based. He submitted that the termination of his services has been resorted by the Employer Bank to victimize him. He stated that since his termination of services is illegal, he by his letter dated 13-05-2005 raised an industrial dispute before the Asst. Labour Commissioner and Conciliation Officer, Panaji -Goa which ended in failure. He therefore prayed that the action of the Employer Bank in terminating his service be held illegal, improper and bad in law and to direct the Employer Bank to reinstate him in the services with full back wages and continuity in services.

3. The Employer/Party II filed written statement on 21st January, 2009 at Exhibit-15. The Employer Bank controverted the claim of the Party I by way

of preliminary objection by stating that the Party-I is not a "Workman" as defined u/s 2(s) of the I. D. Act, 1947 and that no industrial dispute exists as defined u/s 2 (k) of the I. D. Act, 1947. The Employer Bank also stated that the reference has been made by the Government of Goa without any material on record, in haste and without application of mind. The Employer Bank stated that the Party I was initially appointed as a "Trainee Clerk" in the Bank on 04-12-1970 and thereafter as a "Probationary Clerk" on 03-04-1971 and confirmed as Clerk on 01-10-1972. The Employer Bank stated that the Party-I was promoted as a "Junior Officer" in supervisory cadre w.e.f. from 03-12-1975 and confirmed as a "Junior Officer" on 01-01-1977. They stated that there is a separate pay-scale for Officers and as such the Party-I was fitted in the scale of Junior Officers and the total wages drawn by him at the time of termination of his employment is Rs. 12,877/-. They stated that the Party-I in the capacity of Junior Officer performed functions and discharged duties such as checking of documents prepared by the subordinate staff to him of periodical interest products, interest calculated and interest applied, ensure that proper commission is received on the instruments, ensure rectification of defects listed by internal auditors/inspectors, by statutory auditors, by Reserve Bank of India inspectors, etc., pass independently under signature/initial by way of authenticating them for accuracy/correctness, cash, clearing and transfer cheques, instruments, vouchers, etc., be responsible for the correctness of signatures, endorsements and other particulars on the cheques, instruments and vouchers (both debits and credits) passed, ensure that cheques, instruments and vouchers are passed only after they are entered in scrolls, draft letters and correct drafts of replies/correspondence and correspond on behalf of the Bank and sign advices, fate cards, etc, allocate work to clerks working under him and maintain proper records thereof, carry out responsibilities concerning the Departments/Sections/Branch under his control, guide the clerks whose work is supervised, ensure that they carry out all instructions regarding the work given to them according to periodical distribution and according to allotments made as per exigencies, from time to time, appraise clerks under his supervision about changes if any in procedures and systems adhered to, ensure that all the procedures and practices prescribed are scrupulously complied with, ensure that employees subordinate to him carry out all lawful

orders of, discharge duties diligently and faithfully, ensure prompt customer service, is responsible for bills, cheque books, loose leafs, draft leafs and such other items kept under his custody, explain to customers the silent features of various schemes of the Bank and of changes/modifications (like variation in interest rates, etc.) taking place from time to time, supervise proper functioning of computer systems and analyze data, protect system from unauthorized access and misuse, ensure maintenance of all books and registers prescribed for each Section/Department he supervises, ensure that documentation of all types of loans and advances which he supervises is properly executed and that it is kept safely in custody, ensure that all standing instructions are complied with regularly on time by the staff subordinate to him and maintain diary for ensuring prompt action of these and other instructions to be adhered to by them, maintain and keep custody of a separate file containing circulars and instructions concerning the Sections/Departments under his/her control and to ensure that all acts, things, deeds and steps necessary for an effective functioning of the Sections/Departments/branch are taken or done by himself or through the staff placed under him. They stated that the Junior Officers are posted as Branch Managers of the Bank and that the Officer cadre are performing the duties of the Branch Managers. They stated that there are separate service conditions applicable to clerks and sub-staffs on one hand and Officers on the other hand and both these service conditions have been approved by the Government of Goa. They stated that the Party-I was issued a Show Cause Notice bearing No. HO/GM/32/5259 dated 24-01-1996 stating that while audit at Panaji branch for the year 1994-95 was in progress and during the course of internal inspection, it was noticed from the records of the said Panaji branch that there had been four instances of withdrawals which took place during the year 1993-1994 by manipulating balances and entries in some of the Dormant Saving Ledgers. They stated that the Party-I was charged for the following acts of mis-conduct under the service conditions of the Banks

a) fraudulent and/or dishonest acts in relation to the affairs and the assets of the Bank.

b) engaging in divulging Bank secrets and/or acting in the manner in which the interest of the banking institutions.

c) tampering with the Attendance Register or any other book or register of the Bank without permission of the Manager.

They stated that after pursuing the reply filed by the Party-I to the above said Show Cause Notice found to be unsatisfactory, they have decided to issue chargesheet to the Party-I. They stated that the Party-I was issued chargesheet vide their letter No. HO/GM/32/5982 dated 11-03-1996 for the aforementioned acts of misconduct and Shri Rohit P. Lobo was appointed as Enquiry Officer to conduct an enquiry into the charges. They stated that the Enquiry was conducted by an impartial and competent Enquiry Officer. They stated that the Party-I was given every conceivable opportunity to participate and present his case during the enquiry. They stated that after the conclusion of the enquiry, the Enquiry Officer submitted his findings on 05-08-2004 holding the Party-I guilty of charges levelled against him. They stated that they perused the charges, the proceedings of the enquiry and the findings of the Enquiry Officer and concluded that the enquiry has been concluded in accordance with the principles of natural justice and the findings of the Enquiry Officer are fair, proper and based on material/evidence on record. They stated that they have considered the past service of record of the Party I and in view of the gravity of proved misconduct, dismissed the Party-I from the services of the Bank w. e. f. 01-11-2004. They stated that the Party I was a member of the Goa Urban Bank Officers' Association, an association which represents the Officers in the supervisory category including the General Manager and besides this there are two separate bi-partite agreement entered into by them, one through the Union and another through the Officers' Association. They stated that the Party-I in the absence of the Branch Manager has also performed the functions and duties of the Branch Manager. They stated that he was the final authority for passing of the cheques and had full independent authority to allow a prospective customer to open an account. They stated that the Workman in the enquiry proceedings had also admitted the fact that he has performed the supervisory powers of the department which he was heading. They stated that as a "Junior Officer", the Party-I had all the powers to take independent decision which could bind the Employer Bank and the Party-I has taken decisions in exercise of his powers. They crave leave of this Hon'ble Court to lead fresh evidence in the event that the enquiry is set aside on any of the grounds. They denied the entire submissions/ averments made by the Party-I in his Statement of Claim and prayed for the dismissal of the Claim application filed by the Party-I.

4. Thereafter the Party-I filed his Re-joinder on 02-03-2009 at Exhibit 16 to the Written Statement filed by the Employer Bank. The Party-I by way of his Rejoinder confirms and reiterates his case and denied the case of the Employer Bank as pleaded in their Written Statement filed in the present proceedings which are contrary to his case.

5. Thereafter, on the basis of the pleadings filed by the respective Parties this Court framed issues at Exhibit-17 which are as under.

1. *Whether a fair, proper and impartial enquiry was held against the Workman/Party-I in to the alleged misconduct?*

2. *Whether the charges of alleged misconduct levelled against the Workman/Party-I has been proved to the satisfaction of this Court by an acceptable evidence?*

3. *Whether the Workman/Party-I proves that he was a "workman" as defined under Section 2 (s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947?*

4. *Whether the Workman/ Party-I proves that his termination/dismissal from the services of the Employer/Party-II amounts to unfair Labour practices of the fifth schedule of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947?*

5. *Whether the Employer/ Party-I proves that no industrial dispute exists as defined under Section 2 (k) of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947?*

6. *Whether the Workman/Party-I proves that the action of the Employer/Party-II in terminating his services w.e.f. 01-11-2004 is illegal and unjustified?*

7. *Whether the Workman/Party-I is entitled for any relief?*

8. *What Award?*

6. Thereafter, both the Parties were given an opportunity of production and inspection of documents relied by them in the present proceedings in support their respective pleadings. The case was thereafter fixed for filing an Affidavit -in-Evidence of the Party-I. Though several opportunities were granted to the Party-I to lead his evidence in support of his case by filing an Affidavit-in-Evidence, the Party-I has failed to avail the opportunities granted to him so much so that neither he nor his representative could remain present on the relevant dates of hearing. In the circumstances, this Hon'ble Court was compelled to close his evidence by Order dated 30-09-2009 and opportunity was given to the Employer Bank

to lead their evidence in defence. The Ld. Adv. Shri P. Chawdikar appearing for the Employer Bank however submitted that since the Party-I has not adduced any evidence either oral or documentary, the Employer Bank also do not wish to lead any evidence in rebuttal.

7. It is the Party-I who has raised the present Industrial Dispute alleging that the action of the Employer Bank in terminating his services w. e. f. 01-11-2004 is illegal, unjustified and bad in law and it also amounts to unfair labour practices and victimization and therefore claimed that he is entitled to be reinstated in service with full back wages and continuity in service and other consequential benefits. The Employer Bank denied the aforesaid allegations of the Party-I by filing its Written Statement. It was thus incumbent upon the Party-I to have appeared and substantiate his allegation that the termination was not valid or legal. The proceedings before the Labour Court or Industrial Tribunal are judicial in nature, even though the strict formulations of the Indian Evidence Act does not apply to the proceedings, but principles analogues the said Act are applicable to the proceedings before the Labour Court. In a judicial proceeding if no material/evidence is produced, the Party challenging the validity of the Order, the challenge must fail. It is well settled law that if a party challenges the legality of an order, the burden lies upon him to prove illegality of the order and if no evidence is produced, the Party invoking jurisdiction of the Court must fail. Thus, the Party-I having failed to lead any evidence of what-so-ever nature either oral or documentary has failed to substantiate his allegation made by way of his Claim Statement. Consequently, there is absolutely no material on record to prove any of the issues framed by this Hon'ble Court or that the action of the Employer Bank in terminating his services w.e.f. 01-11-2004 is illegal, unjustified and bad in law and that it amounts to unfair labour practice and victimization. With this I proceed to adjudicate the reference as under:

#### ORDER

1. It is adjudicated that the reference that Whether Shri S. S. Dhume, "Junior Officer", can be construed as a Workman as per clause (s) of Section 2 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act 14 of 1947) is answered in the negative.

2. It is adjudicated that the Second term of the reference that if the answer to the issue No. (1)

above is in the affirmative, then, whether the action of the Management of the Goa Urban Co-operative Bank Ltd., Panaji, in terminating the services of Shri S. S. Dhume, "Junior Officer" with effect from 01-11-2004, is legal and justified therefore does not survive.

3. It is held that Shri S. S. Dhume, Junior Officer is not entitled for any relief.

4. No order as to costs.

5. Inform the Government accordingly.

Sd/-  
(Suresh N. Narulkar),  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court-II.

#### Department of Law & Judiciary

Law (Establishment Division)

#### Court of Principal District & Sessions Judge

No. DSC/HOL/121/2009/10989

#### List of Holidays and Vacations for the Year 2010 Approved by the Hon'ble High Court for the District and Subordinate Courts in the North Goa District.

Sr. No.	Holidays	Date	Days of the week
01.	New Year Day	01-01-2010	Friday.
02.	Republic Day	26-01-2010	Tuesday.
03.	Mahashivratri	12-02-2010	Friday.
04.	Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj Jayanti	19-02-2010	Friday.
05.	Dhuli Vandan	01-03-2010	Monday.
06.	Gudi Padwa	16-03-2010	Tuesday.
07.	Ram Navami	24-03-2010	Wednesday.
08.	Maundy Thursday	01-04-2010	Thursday.
09.	Good Friday	02-04-2010	Friday.
10.	Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Jayanti	14-04-2010	Wednesday.
11.	Maharashtra Day/ /May day	01-05-2010	Saturday.
12.	Gopal Kala	02-09-2010	Thursday.
13.	(*) Ramzan Id-UI-Fitr/ /Hartalika Pujan	10-09-2010	Friday.
14.	Mahatma Gandhi Jayanti	02-10-2010	Saturday.
15.	Diwali (Additional day for Diwali)	04-11-2010	Thursday.
16.	Diwali	05-11-2010	Friday.
17.	Govardhan Puja	06-11-2010	Saturday.



Sr. No.	Holidays	Date	Days of the week
18. (*)	Bakari-Id (Id-Uz-Zuha)	17-11-2010	Wednesday.
19.	Feast of St. Francis Xavier	03-12-2010	Friday.
20. (*)	Moharrum	16-12-2010	Thursday.
21.	Christmas Eve	24-12-2010	Friday.

**No days have been proposed as holidays on Account of**

01. (*)	Id-e-Milad	27-02-2010	4th Saturday.
02.	Independence Day	15-08-2010	Sunday.
03.	Ganesh Chaturthi (First Day)	11-09-2010	2nd Saturday.
04.	Ganesh Chaturthi (Second Day)	12-09-2010	Sunday.
05.	Dassehra	17-10-2010	Sunday.
06.	Bhau Bij	07-11-2010	Sunday.
07.	Goa Liberation Day	19-12-2010	Sunday.

**Summer Vacation**

From: 03-05-2010 to 06-06-2010 (Both days inclusive).

**Winter Vacation**

From: 27-12-2010 to 31-12-2010 (Both days inclusive).

Note:-

- (\*) The holidays at Sr. Nos. 13, 18 and 20 and at Sr. No. 1 (Id-e-Milad) under "No days have been proposed as Holidays on account of", will be availed on the days the Government of Goa declares public holidays.
- Please note that the Hon'ble High Court has clarified that these notified holidays and vacations are likely to be modified in near future as per the recommendations of Shetty Commission and directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Writ No. 1022/89 (All India Judges' Association V/s. Union of India and others).

*Nutan D. Sardessai*, Principal District & Sessions Judge, North Goa.

Panaji, 30th December, 2009.

**District & Sessions Court South Goa**

No. DSC/MAR/HOL-69/2009/11030

**List of Holidays and Vacations for the Year 2010 Approved by the Hon'ble High Court, Bombay for the District, and Subordinate Courts in South Goa District.**

Sr. No.	Holidays	Date	Days of the week
01.	New Year Day	01-01-2010	Friday.
02.	Republic Day	26-01-2010	Tuesday.
03.	Mahashivratri	12-02-2010	Friday.
04.	Chhatrapati Shivaji Maharaj Jayanti	19-02-2010	Friday.
05.	Dhuli Vandan	01-03-2010	Monday.
06.	Gudi Padwa	16-03-2010	Tuesday.
07.	Ram Navami	24-03-2010	Wednesday.
08.	Maundy Thursday	01-04-2010	Thursday.
09.	Good Friday	02-04-2010	Friday.
10.	Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Jayanti	14-04-2010	Wednesday.
11.	Maharashtra Day/ /May day	01-05-2010	Saturday.
12.	Gopal Kala	02-09-2010	Thursday.
13.	Ramzan Id-ul-Fitr/ /Hartalika Pujan (*)	10-09-2010	Friday.
14.	Mahatma Gandhi Jayanti	02-10-2010	Saturday.
15.	Diwali (Additional day for Diwali)	04-11-2010	Thursday.
16.	Diwali	05-11-2010	Friday.
17.	Govardhan Puja	06-11-2010	Saturday.
18.	Bakari-Id (Id-Uz-Zuha)(*)	17-11-2010	Wednesday.
19.	Feast of St. Francis Xavier	03-12-2010	Friday.
20.	Moharrum(*)	16-12-2010	Thursday.
21.	Christmas Eve	24-12-2010	Friday.

**No days have been proposed as holidays on Account of**

01.	Id-e-Milad (*)	27-02-2010	4th Saturday.
02.	Independence Day	15-08-2010	Sunday.
03.	Ganesh Chaturthi (First Day)	11-09-2010	2nd Saturday.
04.	Ganesh Chaturthi (Second Day)	12-09-2010	Sunday.
05.	Dassehra	17-10-2010	Sunday.
06.	Bhau Bij	07-11-2010	Sunday.
07.	Goa Liberation Day	19-12-2010	Sunday.

**Summer Vacation**

From: 03-05-2010 to 06-06-2010 (Both days inclusive).

**Winter Vacation**

From: 27-12-2010 to 31-12-2010 (Both days inclusive).

Note:-

1. (\*) The holidays at Sr. Nos. 13, 18 and 20 and at Sr. No. 1 (Id-e-Milad) under "No days have been proposed as Holidays on account of", will be availed on the days the Government of Goa declares public holidays.
2. Please note that the Hon'ble High Court has clarified that these notified holidays and vacations are likely to be modified in near future as per the recommendations of Shetty Commission and directions issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in Writ No. 1022/89 (All India Judges' Association V/s. Union of India and others).

*U. V. Bakre*, Principal District & Sessions Judge, South Goa.

Margao, 29th December, 2009.

**Department of Mines**

Office of Secretary (Mines)

—

**Order**

No. 1/12/08/IIR-Mines/2262

Whereas Late Shri Xec Mohidin Xec Daud was a holder of erstwhile Mining Concession for iron and manganese ore granted under T. C. No. 08 of 12-08-1949 covering an area of 98.0150 ha. of land situated in village of Cudnem of Bicholim Taluka.

And whereas, consequent upon the enactment of the Goa, Daman and Diu Mining Concessions (Abolition and Declaration as Mining Leases) Act, 1987, the above mining concession appearing at Sr. No. 26 in the name of Shri Bascora Seguna Corpo of Schedule I to the said Act, 1987 stood abolished and declared as Mining Lease under the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957.

And whereas, Shri Abdul Azim Sheik Mohidin claiming (hereinafter referred to as the "applicant") to be legal heir of Late Shri Xec Mohidin Xec Daud,

vide application dated 20-11-2006 applied for renewal mining lease for a period of twenty years after a gap of 19 years from the date of expiry of the mining lease.

And whereas, by a notice bearing No. 1/12/08/IIR-Mines/6166 dated 11-02-2008 the applicant was called upon to attend the personal hearing on 20-02-2008 in response to which the applicant attended the hearing. The matter was adjourned several times and finally was taken up on 04-12-2008, on which day, the applicant appeared and pleaded that the application for renewal mining lease be granted.

And whereas, in terms of sub-section (2) of Section 5 of the said Act, 1987 the concession holder was provided a right to apply for renewal of Mining Lease in accordance with the provisions of Mines & Minerals (Development & Regulation) Act, 1957.

And whereas, in view of sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the said Abolition Act, 1987 read with sub-rule (1) and (8) of Rule 24 (A) of Mineral Concession Rules, 1960 the application for renewal for Mining Lease for further period was required to be made before the date the lease was due to expire which was 21-11-1987. The period was extended by the State Government to entertain applications by relaxing the period for one year which ended on 21-11-1988.

And whereas, the legal heir(s) of late concession holder did not apply for renewal of mining lease as required under sub-section (1) of Section 5 of aforesaid Abolition Act, 1987 within prescribed time as per the Mineral Concession Rules, 1960. The application submitted on 20-11-2006 is therefore time barred.

Now, therefore, I, Raajiv Yaduvanshi, Secretary (Mines) in exercise of the powers conferred upon me vide Notification No. 5/80/89-Mines dated 17-11-1989 hereby reject the application dated 20-11-2006 of Shri Abdul Azim Sheik Mohidin for renewal of mining lease as being time barred.

*Raajiv Yaduvanshi*, Secretary (Mines).

Porvorim, 21st December, 2009.

**Order**

No. 1/22/08/IIR-Mines/2258

Whereas Late Shri Harischandra S. N. Tari was a holder of erstwhile Mining Concession for iron and manganese ore granted under T. C. No. 21 dated 29-02-1952 covering an area of 60.6502 ha.

of land situated in village Vichundrem of Sanguem Taluka.

And whereas, consequent upon the enactment of the Goa, Daman and Diu Mining Concessions (Abolition and Declaration as Mining Leases) Act, 1987, the above mining concession appearing at Sr. No. 140 of Schedule I to the said Act, 1987 stood abolished and declared as Mining Lease under the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957.

And whereas, Shri Ramdas Harischandra Tari (hereinafter referred to as the "applicant") claiming to be legal heir of Late Shri Harischandra S. N. Tari vide application dated 21-11-2007 applied for renewal of mining lease for a period of twenty years after a gap of 20 years from the date of expiry of the mining lease.

And whereas, by a notice bearing No. 1/22/08/IIR-Mines/605 dated 12-06-2008 the applicant was called upon to attend the personal hearing on 30-06-2009 in response to which the applicant attended the hearing. The matter was adjourned several times and finally was taken up on 14-08-2008 on which day the applicant appeared, made written submissions and pleaded that the mining lease be granted in his name citing death of his father in year 1985.

And whereas, the submission made by the applicant have been duly considered.

And whereas, in terms of sub-section (2) of Section 5 the concession holder was provided a right to apply for renewal of Mining Lease in accordance with the provisions of Mines & Minerals (Development & Regulation) Act, 1957.

And whereas, in view of sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the said Abolition Act, 1987 read with sub-rule (1) and (8) of Rule 24 (A) of Mineral Concession Rules, 1960 the application for renewal for Mining Lease for further period was required to be made before the date of the lease was due to expire which was 21-11-1987. The period was extended by the State Government to entertain applications by relaxing the period for one year which ended on 21-11-1988.

And whereas, the legal heir(s) of late concession holder did not apply for renewal of mining lease as required under sub-section (1) of Section 5 of aforesaid Abolition Act, 1987 within prescribed time as per the Mineral Concession Rules, 1960. The application submitted on 21-11-2007 is therefore time barred.

Now, therefore, I, Raajiv Yaduvanshi, Secretary (Mines) in exercise of the powers conferred upon

me vide Notification No. 5/80/89-Mines dated 17-11-1989 hereby reject the application dated 21-11-2007 of Shri Ramdas Harischandra Tari Legal heir of Late Shri Harischandra S. N. Tari for renewal of mining lease as being time barred.

*Raajiv Yaduvanshi*, Secretary (Mines).

Porvorim, 21st December, 2009.

#### Order

No. 1/7/08/IIR-Mines/2260

Whereas Late Shri Krishna Vamona Keni was a holder of erstwhile Mining Concession for iron and manganese ore granted under T. C. No. 84 dated 14-12-1959 covering an area of 46.2700 ha. of land situated in village Curchirem of Bicholim Taluka.

And whereas, consequent upon the enactment of the Goa, Daman and Diu Mining Concessions (Abolition and Declaration as Mining Leases) Act, 1987, the above mining concession appearing at Sr. No. 567 of Schedule I to the said Act, 1987 stood abolished and declared as Mining Lease under the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957.

And whereas, Shri Ghaneshyam Krishna Kenny (hereinafter referred to as the "applicant") claiming to be legal heir of Late Shri Krishna Vamona Keni vide application dated 12-11-2007 applied for renewal of mining lease for a period of twenty years after a gap of 20 years from the date of expiry of the mining lease and sought condonation of delay.

And whereas, by a notice bearing No. 1/7/08/IIR-Mines/6368 dated 26-02-2008 the applicant was called upon to attend the personal hearing on 11-03-2008 in response to which the applicant attended the hearing. The matter was adjourned several times and finally was taken up on 4-12-08 on which day neither the applicant nor his representative appeared.

And whereas, in terms of sub-section (2) of Section 5 the concession holder was provided a right to apply for renewal of Mining Lease in accordance with the provisions of Mines & Minerals (Development & Regulation) Act, 1957.

And whereas, in view of sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the said Abolition Act, 1987 read with sub-rule (1) and (8) of Rule 24 (A) of Mineral Concession Rules, 1960 the application for renewal for Mining Lease for further period was required to be made before the date of the lease was due to expire which was 21-11-1987. The period was

extended by the State Government to entertain applications by relaxing the period for one year which ended on 21-11-1988.

And whereas, the legal heir(s) of late concession holder did not apply for the renewal of mining lease as required under sub-section (1) of Section 5 aforesaid Abolition Act, 1987 within prescribed time as per the Mineral Concession Rules, 1960. The application submitted on 21-11-2007 is therefore time barred.

Now, therefore, I, Raajiv Yaduvanshi, Secretary (Mines) in exercise of the powers conferred upon me vide Notification No. 5/80/89-Mines dated 17-11-1989 hereby reject the application dated 12-11-2007 of Shri Ghaneshyam Krishna Kenny alleged for renewal of mining lease as being time barred.

*Raajiv Yaduvanshi, Secretary (Mines).*

Porvorim, 21st December, 2009.

---

**Order**

No. 1/26/08/IIR-Mines/2252

Whereas Late Shri Sadassiv Sinai Gaitonde was a holder of erstwhile Mining Concession for iron ore granted under T. C. No. 98 of 02-10-1953 covering an area of 99.310010 ha. of land situated in village Surla of Bicholim Taluka.

And whereas, consequent upon the enactment of the Goa, Daman and Diu Mining Concessions (Abolition and Declaration as Mining Leases) Act, 1987, the above mining concession appearing at Sr. No. 272 of Schedule I to the said Act, 1987 stood abolished and declared as Mining Lease under the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957.

And whereas, Shri Amir Sadashiv Sinai Gaitonde (hereinafter referred to as the "applicant") claiming to be legal heir of Late Shri Sadashiv Sinai Gaitonde vide application dated 3-3-2008 applied for renewal of mining lease for a period of twenty years after a gap of 21 years from the date of expiry of the mining lease.

And whereas, by a notice bearing No. 1/26/08/IIR-Mines/3254 dated 02-12-2008 the applicant was called upon to attend the personal hearing on 12-12-2008 in response to which the applicant attended the hearing. The matter was adjourned several times and finally was taken up on 20-02-2009 on which day the applicant made written submissions vide letter dated 20-02-2009 and pleaded that the mining lease be granted. The

submissions made by the applicant have been duly considered.

And whereas, in terms of sub-section (2) of Section 5 of the said Act, 1987 the concession holder was provided a right to apply for renewal of Mining Lease in accordance with the provisions of Mines & Minerals (Development & Regulation) Act, 1957.

And whereas, in view of sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the said Abolition Act, 1987 read with sub-rule (1) and (8) of Rule 24 (A) of Mineral Concession Rules, 1960 the application for renewal for Mining Lease for further period was required to be made before the date of the lease was due to expire which was 21-11-1987. The period was extended by the State Government to entertain applications by relaxing the period for one year which ended on 21-11-1988.

And whereas, the legal heir(s) of late concession holder did not apply for renewal of mining lease as required under sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the aforesaid Abolition Act, 1987 within prescribed time as per the Mineral Concession Rules, 1960. The application submitted on 03-03-2008 is therefore time barred.

Now, therefore, I, Raajiv Yaduvanshi, Secretary (Mines) in exercise of the powers conferred upon me vide Notification No. 5/80/89-Mines dated 17-11-1989 hereby reject the application dated 03-03-2008 of Shri Amir Sadashiv Sinai Gaitonde for renewal of mining lease as being time barred.

*Raajiv Yaduvanshi, Secretary (Mines).*

Porvorim, 21st December, 2009.

---

**Order**

No. 1/17/08/IIR-Mines/2254

Whereas Late Shri Daud Khan was a holder of erstwhile Mining Concession for iron and manganese ore granted under T. C. No. 58 dated 03-09-1951 covering an area of 87.5400 ha. of land situated in village Rivona of Sanguem Taluka.

And whereas, consequent upon the enactment of the Goa, Daman and Diu Mining Concessions (Abolition and Declaration as Mining Leases) Act, 1987, the above mining concession appearing at Sr. No. 112 of Schedule I to the said Act, 1987 stood abolished and declared as Mining Lease under the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957.

And whereas, Smt. Mariam Bi Khan (hereinafter referred to as the "applicant") claiming to be legal



heir of Late Shri Daud Khan vide application dated 20-11-2006 applied for renewal of mining lease for a period of twenty years after a gap of 19 years from the date of expiry of the mining lease.

And whereas, by a notice bearing No. 1/17/08/IIR-Mines/6173 dated 11-02-2008 the applicant was called upon to attend the personal hearing on 20-02-2008 in response to which the applicant attended the said hearing. The matter was adjourned several times and finally was taken up on 04-12-08 on which day the applicants representative, Shri Hussain Khan appeared and pleaded that the application for renewal of mining lease be granted.

And whereas, in terms of sub-section (2) of Section 5 of the concession holder was provided a right to apply for renewal of Mining Lease in accordance with the provisions of Mines & Minerals (Development & Regulation) Act, 1957.

And whereas, in view of sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the said Abolition Act, 1987 read with sub-rule (1) and (8) of Rule 24 (A) of Mineral Concession Rules, 1960 the application for renewal of Mining Lease for further period was required to be made before the date of the lease was due to expire which was 21-11-1987. The period was extended by the State Government to entertain applications by relaxing the period for one year which ended on 21-11-1988.

And whereas, the legal heir(s) of late concession holder did not apply for the renewal of mining lease as required under sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the aforesaid Abolition Act, 1987 within prescribed time as per the Mineral Concession Rules, 1960. The application submitted on 20-11-2006 is therefore time barred.

Now, therefore, I, Raajiv Yaduvanshi, Secretary (Mines) in exercise of the powers conferred upon me vide Notification No. 5/80/89-Mines dated 17-11-1989 hereby reject the application dated 20-11-2006 of Smt. Mariam Bi Khan for renewal of mining lease as being time barred.

*Raajiv Yaduvanshi, Secretary (Mines).*

Porvorim, 21st December, 2009.

---

#### Order

No. 1/14/08/IIR-Mines/2255

Whereas Late Shri Xec Mohidin Xec Daud was a holder of erstwhile Mining Concession for iron and manganese ore granted under T. C. No. 40

dated 15-05-1953 covering an area of 33.0760 ha. of land situated in village Sancordem of Sanguem Taluka.

And whereas, consequent upon the enactment of the Goa, Daman and Diu Mining Concessions (Abolition and Declaration as Mining Leases) Act, 1987, the above mining concession appearing at Sr. No. 230 of Schedule I to the said Act, 1987 stood abolished and declared as Mining Lease under the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957.

And whereas, Shri Abdul Azim Sheik Mohidin (hereinafter referred to as the "applicant") claiming to be legal heir of Late Shri Xec Mohidin Xec Daud vide application dated 20-11-2006 applied for renewal of mining lease for a period of twenty years after a gap of 20 years from the date of expiry of the mining lease.

And whereas, by a notice bearing No. 1/14/08/IIR-Mines/6167 dated 11-02-2008 the applicant was called upon to attend the personal hearing in response to which the applicant attended the hearing. At the time of personal hearing the applicant made written submissions vide letter dated 11-03-2008. The submissions made by the applicant have been duly considered. The matter was adjourned several times and finally was taken up on 04-12-2008 on which day the applicant appeared and pleaded that the mining lease be granted.

And whereas, in terms of sub-section (2) of Section 5 of the said Act, 1987 the concession holder was provided a right to apply for renewal of Mining Lease in accordance with the provisions of Mines & Minerals (Development & Regulation) Act, 1957.

And whereas, in view of sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the said Abolition Act, 1987 read with sub-rule (1) and (8) of Rule 24 (A) of Mineral Concession Rules, 1960 the application for renewal of Mining Lease for further period was required to be made before the date of the lease was due to expire which was 21-11-1987. The period was extended by the State Government to entertain applications by relaxing the period by one year which ended on 21-11-1988.

And whereas, the legal heir(s) of late concession holder did not apply for the renewal of mining lease as required under sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the aforesaid Abolition Act, 1987 within prescribed time as per the Mineral Concession Rules, 1960. The application submitted on 20-11-2006 is therefore time barred.

Now, therefore, I, Raajiv Yaduvanshi, Secretary (Mines) in exercise of the powers conferred upon me vide Notification No. 5/80/89-Mines dated 17-11-1989 hereby reject the application dated 20-11-2006 of Shri Abdul Azim Sheik Mohidin for renewal of mining lease as being time barred.

*Raajiv Yaduvanshi, Secretary (Mines).*

Porvorim, 21st December, 2009.

---

### Order

No. 1/29/08/IIR-Mines/2257

Whereas Late Shri Joao Santana Gomes (Jr) was a holder of erstwhile Mining Concession for iron and manganese ore granted under T. C. No. 3 of 31-01-1955 covering an area of 93.7250 ha. of land situated in village Sancordem of Sanguem Taluka.

And whereas, consequent upon the enactment of the Goa, Daman and Diu Mining Concessions (Abolition and Declaration as Mining Leases) Act, 1987, the above mining concession appearing at Sr. No. 349 of Schedule I to the said Act, 1987 in the name of V. M. Salgaonkar Irmaos Ltda. stood abolished and declared as Mining Lease under the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Act, 1957.

And whereas, Mrs. Marcia Maria Piedade Gomes (hereinafter referred to as the "applicant") claiming to be legal heir of Late Shri Joao Santana Gomes (Jr) vide application dated 21-11-2007 applied for renewal of mining lease for a period of twenty years after a gap of 20 years from the date of expiry of the mining lease.

And whereas, by a notice bearing No. 1/29/08/IIR-Mines/3285 dated 5-12-2008 the applicant was called upon to attend the personal hearing on 12-12-2008 on which day, neither the applicant nor his representative appeared.

And whereas, in terms of sub-section (2) of Section 5 of the said Act, 1987 the concession holder was provided a right to apply for renewal of Mining Lease in accordance with the provisions of Mines & Minerals (Development & Regulation) Act, 1957.

And whereas, in view of sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the said Abolition Act, 1987 read with sub-rule (1) and (8) of Rule 24 (A) of Mineral Concession Rules, 1960 the application for renewal of Mining Lease for further period was required to be made before the date of the lease was due to expire which was 21-11-1987. The period was

extended by the State Government to entertain application by relaxing the period to one year which ended on 21-11-1988.

And whereas, the legal heir(s) of late concession holder did not apply for the renewal of mining lease as required under sub-section (1) of Section 5 of the aforesaid Abolition Act, 1987 within prescribed time as per the Mineral Concession Rules, 1960. The application submitted on 21-11-2007 is therefore time barred.

Now, therefore, I, Raajiv Yaduvanshi, Secretary (Mines) in exercise of the powers conferred upon me vide Notification No. 5/80/89-Mines dated 17-11-1989 hereby reject the application dated 21-11-2007 of Mrs. Marcia Maria Piedade Gomes for renewal of mining lease as being time barred.

*Raajiv Yaduvanshi, Secretary (Mines).*

Porvorim, 21st December, 2009.

---

### Corrigendum

No. 96/377/88/IIR-Mines/3273

In partial modification to the Order No. 96/377/88/IIR-Mines/3243 dated 14-12-2009, the figure 69.4743 indicated in the Schedule appended to the said Order shall be read as 69.4745.

*Arvind D. Loliyekar, Director of Mines and Geology.*

Panaji, 21st December, 2009.

---

## Department of Panchayati Raj and Community Development

Directorate of Panchayats

---

### Notification

No. 19/35/DP/BYE-ELN/08/4935

In pursuance of sub-section (8) of Section 7 of the Goa Panchayat Raj Act, 1994 (Goa Act 14 of 1994), read with Rule 58 of the Goa Panchayat and Zilla Panchayats (Election Procedure) Rules, 1996, it is hereby notified for the information of the public that the persons specified in column No. 3 of the Schedule appended hereto have been duly elected as members of the Panchayats mentioned in the corresponding entry in column No. 2 from the wards shown against their names in column No. 4 of the said Schedule in the bye-elections held on 20-12-2009.

## SCHEDULE

Sr. No.	Name of Village Panchayat	Name and address of the elected member	Ward No.
1	2	3	4
1.	Village Panchayat Rachol, Salcete-Goa	Smt. Minguelina Glorio Fernandes E. Pereira, H. No. 197, Ilhas de Rachol, Salcete-Goa	I
2.	Village Panchayat Macasana, Salcete-Goa	Shri Benedito Jose Pedro F. Xavier Almeida, H. No. 519, Pokrem, Salcete-Goa	II

*Menino D'Souza*, Director of Panchayats & ex officio Jt. Secretary.

Panaji, 23rd December, 2009.



## Department of Personnel

—  
Order

No. 13/22/2006-Per (A)

- Read: 1) Govt. Order No. 13/22/2006-Per(A) dated 29-09-2006.
- 2) Govt. Order No. 13/22/2006-Per(A) dated 25-09-2007.
- 3) Govt. Order No. 13/22/2006-Per(A) dated 31-12-2007.
- 4) Govt. Order No. 5/23/77-Per dated 02-01-2009.
- 5) Govt. Corrigendum No. 5/23/77-Per dated 04-02-2009.
- 6) Govt. Order No. 5/23/77-Per dated 12-02-2009.

Governor of Goa is pleased to grant extension in service to Shri Nirmal Braganza, Chief Electrical Engineer for a further period of four months with effect from 01-01-2010 to 30-04-2010.

The extension is subject to termination without assigning any reasons at any time during the period of extension.

This order is being issued in pursuance to the Order dated 16th December, 2009 of the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay at Goa in Misc. CIVIL

APPLICATION No. 996 of 2009 in WRIT PETITION No. 438 of 2009.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Umeshchandra L. Joshi*, Under Secretary (Personnel).

Porvorim, 23rd December, 2009.

## Order

No. 13/22/2006-Per (B)

- Read: 1) Govt. Order No. 13/22/2006-Per(B) dated 29-09-2006.
- 2) Govt. Order No. 13/22/2006-Per(B) dated 30-11-2007.
- 3) Govt. Order No. 13/22/2006-Per(B) dated 28-11-2008.

Governor of Goa is pleased to grant ex-post facto extension in service to Shri S. T. Bhangui, Superintending Engineer (Electrical) for a further period of five months with effect from 01-12-2009 to 30-04-2010.

The period of absence from 01-12-2009 till the issue of this Order shall be treated as leave.

The extension is subject to termination without assigning any reasons at any time during the period of extension.

This order is being issued in pursuance to the Order dated 16th December, 2009 of the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay at Goa in MISC. CIVIL APPLICATION No. 995 of 2009 IN WRIT PETITION No. 438 of 2009.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Umeshchandra L. Joshi*, Under Secretary (Personnel).

Porvorim, 23rd December, 2009.

## Notification

No. 7/6/99-PER (P. F.)

- Read: 1) Notification No. 7/6/99-PER(P. F.) dated 16-10-2009.

- 2) Order No. 7/15/2009-PER dated 18-12-2009.

In partial modification of the Notification of even number dated 16-10-2009 read above, the

department viz. 'Archives & Archaeology' hitherto being looked after by Shri C. P. Tripathi, IAS (AGMU: 96), Secretary (PWD) shall stand allotted to Shri Narendra Kumar, IAS (AGMUT: 88), Secretary to Governor with immediate effect.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Umeshchandra L. Joshi*, Under Secretary (Personnel-I).

Porvorim, 23rd December, 2009.

#### Corrigendum

No. 7/15/2009-PER

Read: 1. Order No. 7/15/2009-PER dated 18-12-2009.

2. Order No. 6/9/2009-PER (Part I) dated 07-12-2009.

The third para of the order dated 18-12-2009, read above shall be corrected to read as:

Further Shri Tahang Taggu, IAS (AGMU: 99), shall hold the additional charge of the post of Director, Tribal Welfare, thereby relieving Shri N. B. Narvekar, Director of Social Welfare of the additional charge of the post of Director (Tribal Welfare) allotted vide order dated 07-12-2009 read at (2) above and shall report to Shri Rajeev Verma, IAS, Secretary (Social Welfare), who is incharge of Tribal Welfare.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Umeshchandra L. Joshi*, Under Secretary (Personnel-I).

Porvorim, 23rd December, 2009.

#### Department of Planning

Directorate of Planning, Statistics and Evaluation

#### Order

No. DPSE/8th-AISES/MAIN/2009/2013

The Government of Goa is pleased to appoint the following officers to the posts shown against their names in addition to their normal duties, for the smooth conduct of 8th All India School

Education Survey in Goa with effect from 01-09-2009.

Sr. No.	Name & designation of the Officer(s)	Post to which appointed in addition to normal duties	Duration
1	2	3	4
1.	Shri Anand Sherkhane, Director (Planning, Statistics and Evaluation)	Ex officio Director of the Survey	2 years.
2.	Shri V. B. Saxena, Joint Director	State Survey Officer	2 years.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Anand Sherkhane*, Director (Planning, Statistics & Evaluation).

Panaji, 7th December, 2009.

#### Department of Power

Office of the Chief Electrical Engineer

#### Order

No. STA/ELECT/INSPT/CONF/4621

Read: 1) Government Order No. STA/ELECT/INSPT/CONF/3452 dated 15-10-2009.

2) Addendum No. STA/ELECT/INSPT/CONF/3853 dated 6-11-2009.

Government is pleased to extend ex-post facto contractual re-appointment of Shri R. A. Ghali, (retired Chief Electrical Engineer) as "Electrical Inspector" in the pay scale of PB—3 Rs. 15,600-39,100+G.P. Rs. 7,600/- for the State Electrical Inspectorate, Government of Goa, Vidyut Bhavan, Panaji, for a further period of five months w.e.f. 21-11-2009 to 20-4-2010.

He shall draw emoluments for the above stated period in terms of C.C.S. (Fixation of pay of re-employed Pensioners) orders, 1986.

His extension of re-appointment is further subject to executing the agreement specifying the terms and conditions of re-employment.

This order is being issued in pursuance to the interim Orders dated 21-11-2009 and 25-11-2009 and Order dated 1-12-2009 of the Hon'ble High



Court of Bombay at Goa in Misc. Civil Application No. 724 of 2009 in Writ Petition No. 438 of 2009.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Nirmal Braganza*, ex officio Addl. Secretary.

Panaji, 28th December, 2009.

### Department of Public Health

#### Order

No. 47/29/2005-I/PHD

Government is pleased to transfer the following Medical Officers under the Directorate of Health Services in public interest with immediate effect and post them to the places indicated against their names:

Sr. No.	Name of the Medical Officer	Present posting	Posted at
1	2	3	4
1.	Dr. Viraj Parab, Medical Officer	Community Health Centre, Curchorem	Primary Health Centre, Cansaulim.
2.	Dr. Edger Menezes, Medical Officer	Primary Health Centre, Cansaulim	Community Health Centre, Curchorem.

The Medical Officers are transferred at their own request and hence are not entitled for transfer TA/Joining time.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Paula Fernandes*, Under Secretary (Health-II).

Porvorim, 15th December, 2009.

#### Order

No. 45/6/2009-I/PHD

Read: Memorandum No. 45/6/2009-I/PHD dated 17-12-2009.

On the recommendation of the Goa Public Service Commission as conveyed vide their letter No. COM/1/5/24(9)/89-09/Vol.I/237 dated 28-07-2009, Government is pleased to appoint Dr. Shirley Wilfred Bridget Riberio, to the post of Senior Radiologist (Group "A"

Gazetted) in the Pay Band—3 of Rs. 15,600-39,100 + (Grade Pay) Rs. 6,600/- under the Directorate of Health Services with immediate effect as per the terms and conditions contained in the Memorandum cited above and post her at Asilo Hospital, Mapusa.

The pay of Dr. Shirley Wilfred Bridget Riberio, Sr. Radiologist shall be fixed in terms of provisions of FR 22 (I)(a)(2).

Dr. Shirley Wilfred Bridget Riberio shall be on probation for a period of two years.

Her character and antecedents have been verified by the District Magistrate, North Goa District, Panaji-Goa and she was declared medically fit by the Medical Board at the time of appointment as Junior Radiologist on regular basis in Directorate of Health Services.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*D. G. Sardessai*, Joint Secretary (Health).

Porvorim, 23rd December, 2009.

#### Notification

No. 13/144/87-I/PHD(Part)

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 87A of the Goa, Daman and Diu Public Health Act, 1985 (Act 25 of 1985) (hereinafter referred to as the "said Act") and in supersession of the Government Notification No. 13/144/87-I/PHD(Part)(C) dated 20-12-2004, published in the Official Gazette, (Extraordinary No. 3), Series II No. 38 dated 20-12-2004, the Government of Goa, being satisfied that the use or consumption of the articles of food containing tobacco is injurious to public health and that in the public interest it is necessary or expedient so to do, hereby prohibits the consumption, manufacture, sale, distribution, storing or stocking of the following articles of food, in the entire State of Goa, with immediate effect:

"Any article of food containing tobacco and/or tobacco extracts thereof with any kind of flavour, including cardamom, menthol and/or any kind of sweetener including sugar, glycerine, glucose and/or aromatic herbs and spices including any fruits, sliver leaf, saffron, mulethi, submercosa and lime, all or any of them, by whatever name called".

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Paula Fernandes*, Under Secretary (Health-II).

Porvorim, 5th January, 2010.

**Certificate**

No. 45/2/2007-I/PHD/PF.

Read: 1) Memorandum No. 45/2/2007-I/PHD/  
/PF. dated 13-08-2009.2) Government Order No. 45/2/2007-I/  
/PHD/PF. dated 17-08-2009.

Certified that the character and antecedents of Dr. Svitlana Josphine Gomes, Hospicio Hospital, Margao, under Directorate of Health Services mentioned in the above Orders have been verified by the District Magistrate, South Goa District, Margao and nothing adverse has come to the notice of the Government. She has also been declared medically fit by the Medical Board.

*Paula Fernandes*, Under Secretary (Health-II).

Porvorim, 18th December, 2009.

**Department of Public Works**

Office of the Principal Chief Engineer

—

**Order**

No. 40/2/2009/PCE-PWD-ADM(II)/302

Government is pleased to order the transfer of the following Assistant Engineer/Assistant Surveyor of Works (Civil) in this Department and post them at the places shown against their names in column No. 4 below, with immediate effect in public interest.

Sr. No.	Name	From	To
1	2	3	4
1.	Smt. Suchita S. Naique	Assistant Surveyor of Works, Division XIV, Margao	As Assistant Engineer, Sub-Division IV, Division XIX, Bambolim vice Shri Anthony Mathew transferred.
2.	Shri Anthony Mathew	Assistant Engineer, Sub-Division IV, Division XIX, Bambolim	As Assistant Surveyor of Works, Division XIV, Margao vice Smt. Suchita Naique transferred.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*A. M. Wachasundar*, Principal Chief Engineer, PWD & ex officio Addl. Secretary.

Panaji, 22nd December, 2009.

**Notification**

No. 19-3-PCE-PWD-EO/2009-10/122

The Ministry of Road, Transport and Highways is taking up upgradation of National Highways in various phases of NHDP through National Highway Authority of India (NHAI) with ambitious target of building 20 kms. of National Highway everyday. To achieve the target, NHAI have formulated annual work plans for awarding 12,000 kms. and 11,000 kms. of work during 2009-10 and 2010-11 respectively.

To streamline co-ordination among various State Departments, a State High Level Committee under the Chairmanship of the Chief Secretary has been constituted consisting of the following members:

1. Chief Secretary, Govt. of Goa ... Chairman.
2. Secretary (PWD) ... Member.
3. Secretary (Revenue) ... Member.
4. Secretary (Power) ... Member.
5. Secretary (Forest) ... Member.
6. Secretary (Transport) ... Member.
7. Secretary (Law) ... Member.
8. Collector (North/South) ... Member.
9. Principal Chief Engineer, PWD ... Member.
10. Chief Engineer, (Roads), PWD ... Member.
11. Chief Engineer, Electricity Dept. ... Member.
12. Superintending Engineer-IX (NH), PWD ... Member.
13. Chief General Manager, NHAI ... Member Secretary.

The Chairman shall have the authority to add any other officer as member in the Committee or special invitee.

*A. M. Wachasundar*, Principal Chief Engineer, PWD.

Panaji, 22nd December, 2009.

**Department of Revenue**

—

**Order**

No. 3/4/2008-RD

Ref.: Order No. 3/4/2008-RD dated 12th November, 2009.

Read: Letter of the Mamlatdar and the Administrator of Devasthan bearing No. Mam/Per/Dev/Cas/2009/1443 dated 26-11-2009.

Whereas, vide Order No. 3/4/2008-RD dated 12th November, 2009, a new Committee under

Presidentship of Mamlatdar of Pernem was constituted for the remaining period of triennium upto 2010 for Shree Mahadev Sateri Devasthan, Casarvarnem, Pernem, alongwith Shri Babi Naik as Attorney and Shri Vivek Naik as Treasurer.

And whereas, it has come to the notice of the Administrator of Devasthan and the Mamlatdar of Pernem that the names of Shri Babi K. Naik, Attorney and Shri Vivek Naik, Treasurer are allegedly involved in printing of bogus receipts and bogus stamps in the name of Devasthan for which a complaint has been filed by the Administrator in Police Station at Pernem.

And whereas, the Government after considering the said letter of the Administrator dated 26-11-2009 has decided to substitute the names of Shri Raghoba P. Naik as Attorney and Shri Ganpat K. Naik as Treasurer in place of Shri Babi K. Naik, Attorney and Shri Vivek K. Naik, Treasurer.

Now therefore, in view of the above, the following have been appointed to the New Committee under the Presidentship of the Mamlatdar of Pernem for the remaining period of triennium 2010 as under:-

- |                         |            |
|-------------------------|------------|
| 1. Mamlatdar of Pernem  | President. |
| 2. Shri Raghoba P. Naik | Attorney.  |
| 3. Shri Ganpat K. Naik  | Treasurer. |

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*D. M. Redkar*, Under Secretary (Rev-I).

Porvorim, 23rd December, 2009.

#### Notification

No. 23/21/2009-RD

Whereas by Government Notification No. 23/21/2009-RD dated 23-07-2009, published on Series II No. 19 of the Official Gazette dated 06-08-2009 and in two newspapers (1) "Herald" dated 29-07-2009 and (2) "Ranazunzar" dated 29-07-2009, it was notified under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Central Act 1 of 1894) (hereinafter referred to as "the said Act") that the land specified in the Schedule appended to the said Notification (hereinafter referred to as the said land), was needed for public purpose viz. Land Acquisition for const. of Calangute distributory from ch. 0.00 m. to 1475 for L.B.M.C. of TIP in Village Parra and Saligao Village of Bardez Taluka (addl. area).

And whereas, the Government of Goa (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") being of the opinion that the acquisition of the said land is urgently necessary, hereby applies the provisions of sub-section (1) of Section 17 of the said Act and directs that the Collector appointed under paragraph 2 below, shall at any time, on the expiry of fifteen days from the date of the publication of the notice relating to the said land under sub-section (1) of Section 9 of the said Act, take possession of the said land.

Now, therefore, the Government hereby declares, under the provisions of Section 6 of the said Act that the said land is required for the public purpose specified above.

2. The Government also hereby appoints under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act, the Special Land Acquisition Officer, Goa Tillari Irrigation Development Corporation, Karaswada, Colvale road, Bardez-Goa to perform the functions of the Collector, for all proceedings hereinafter to be taken in respect of the said land and directs him under Section 7 of the said Act to take order for the acquisition of the said land.

3. A plan of the said land can be inspected at the office of the said the Special Land Acquisition Officer, Goa Tillari Irrigation Development Corporation, Karaswada, Colvale road, Bardez-Goa till the award is made under Section 11.

#### SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

*Taluka:* Bardez *Village:* Saligao/Parra

Survey No./ Sub-Div. No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approx. Area in sq. mts.
1	2	3

Village: Saligao

238/10 P	O: Aleluia Pinto Lobe. T: Krishna Sagun Tuyenkar.	210
----------	--	-----

*Boundaries :*

North : S. No. 238/10, 9.

South : S. No. 238/16.

East : S. No. 238/10.

West : S. No. 238/11, 12, 10.

Village: Parra

1	2	3
150/5 P	O: Comunidade. O: Goa Tillari Irrigation Development Corporation, Sub-Div. No. II Works Div. VI for an area of 240 sq. mts. T: Nicolao Jose Fernandes.	85
<i>Boundaries :</i>		
North : S. No. 150/5.		
South : S. No. 150/5.		
East : S. No. 150/5.		
West : S. No. 150/5.		
		Total: 295

By order and in the name of the Governor  
of Goa.

*D. M. Redkar*, Under Secretary (Revenue-I).

Porvorim, 24th December, 2009.

#### Notification

No. 23/51/2008-RD

Whereas by Government Notification No. 23/51/2008-RD dated 18-11-2008 published on Series II No. 35 of the Official Gazette dated 27-11-2008 and in two newspapers (1) "Navhind Times" dated 21-11-2008 and (2) "Sunaparant" dated 21-11-2008, it was notified under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Central Act 1 of 1894) (hereinafter referred to as "the said Act") that the land specified in the Schedule appended to the said Notification (hereinafter referred to as the said land), was needed for public purpose viz. Land Acquisition for construction of 800m<sup>3</sup> GLR and approach road at Baithakhhol, Borim Village of Ponda Taluka.

And whereas, the Government of Goa (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") being of the opinion that the acquisition of the said land is urgently necessary, hereby applies the provisions of sub-section (1) of Section 17 of the said Act and directs that the Collector appointed under paragraph 2 below, shall at any time, on the expiry of fifteen days from the date of the publication of the notice relating to the said land under sub-section (1) of Section 9 of the said Act, take possession of the said land.

Now, therefore, the Government hereby declares, under the provisions of Section 6 of the said Act that the said land is required for the public purpose specified above.

2. The Government also hereby appoints under

clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act, the Dy. Collector/SDO LAO, Ponda-Goa to perform the functions of the Collector, for all proceedings hereinafter to be taken in respect of the said land and directs him under Section 7 of the said Act to take order for the acquisition of the said land.

3. A plan of the said land can be inspected at the office of the said the Dy. Collector/SDO & LAO, Ponda-Goa till the award is made under Section 11.

#### SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

*Taluka:* Ponda

*Village:* Borim

Survey No./ Sub-Div. No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Area in sq. mts.
1	2	3
352/1	O: 1. Comunidade of Borim. 2. Abel Gomes. 3. Zeferino Gomes. 4. Gregory Gomes.	1860

#### Boundaries :

North : S. No. 352/1.

South : S. No. 352/1.

East : Road, S. No. 352/1.

West : S. No. 352/1, 1-A.

Total: 1860

By order and in the name of the Governor  
of Goa.

*D. M. Redkar*, Under Secretary (Revenue-I).

Porvorim, 24th December, 2009.

#### Notification

No. 23/25/2008-RD

Whereas by Government Notification No. 23/25/2008-RD dated 24-09-2008 published on page 770 of Series II No. 27 of the Official Gazette, dated 03-10-2008 and in two newspapers (1) "Navhind Times" dated 27-09-2008 and (2) "Pudhari" dated 27-09-2008, it was notified under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Central Act 1 of 1894) (hereinafter referred to as "the said Act") that the land specified in the Schedule appended to the said Notification was likely to be needed for the public purpose viz. Land Acquisition of 300 m<sup>3</sup> GLR at Ladfe, in Latambarcem Village in Bicholim Constituency (Survey No. 381/1).



And whereas, the Government of Goa (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") after considering the report made under sub-section (2) of Section 5-A of the said Act is satisfied that the land specified in the Schedule hereto is needed for the public purpose specified above (hereinafter referred to "the said land").

Now, therefore, the Government hereby declares, under Section 6 of the said Act that the said land is required for the public purpose specified above.

2. The Government also appoints under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act, the Dy. Collector/SDO, Bicholim-Goa to perform the functions of the Collector, for all proceedings hereinafter to be taken in respect of the said land and directs him under Section 7 of the said Act to take order for the acquisition of the said land.

3. A plan of the said land can be inspected at the office of the said the Dy. Collector & SDO Bicholim-Goa till the award is made under Section 11.

#### SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

*Taluka:* Bicholim

*Village:* Latambarcem

Survey No./ Sub-Div. No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Area in sq. mts.
1	2	3
381/1 O:	1. Suryakant Chandru Malik. 2. Manohar Vishram Bhagat. 3. Dattaram Nagesh Chari. 4. Prabhakar Guno Naik. 5. Suresh Soma Kambli. 6. Subhash Narayan Naik. 7. Nitin Digambar Patade. 8. Das Vaman Pednekar. 9. Samir Chandrakant Chari. 10. Umesh Harischandra Mopkar. 11. Ramesh Harischandra Mopkar.	200

#### Boundaries :

North : S. No. 381/1.  
South : S. No. 381/1.  
East : S. No. 381/1.  
West : S. No. 381/1.

Total: 200

By order and in the name of the Governor  
of Goa.

*D. M. Redkar*, Under Secretary (Revenue-I).  
Porvorim, 24th December, 2009.

#### Notification

No. 23/24/2008-RD

Whereas by Government Notification No. 23/24/2008-RD dated 26-09-2008 published on pages 802 to 803 of Series II No. 29 of the Official Gazette, dated 16-10-2008 and in two newspapers (1) "Gomantak" dated 03-10-2008 and (2) "Herald" dated 02-10-2008. Subsequently Corrigendum No. 23/24/2008-RD dated 09-01-2009 published on page 1022 of Series II No. 42 of the Official Gazette dated 15-01-2009 and in two newspapers (1) "Gomantak" dated 13-01-2009 and (2) "Herald" dated 13-01-2009 it was notified under Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Central Act 1 of 1894) (hereinafter referred to as "the said Act") that the land specified in the Schedule appended to the said Notification (hereinafter referred to as the said land), was needed for public purpose viz. Land Acquisition for Const. of internal roads at Devaddem in V. P. Shiroda in Shiroda Constituency.

And whereas, the Government of Goa (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") after considering the report made under sub-section (2) of Section 5-A of the said Act is satisfied that the land specified in the Schedule hereto is needed for the public purpose specified above (hereinafter referred to "the said land").

Now, therefore, the Government hereby declares, under Section 6 of the said Act that the said land is required for the public purpose specified above.

2. The Government also appoints under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act, the Land Acquisition Officer, PWD (Cell), Altinho, Panaji-Goa to perform the functions of the Collector, for all proceedings hereinafter to be taken in respect of the said land and directs him under Section 7 of the said Act to take order for the acquisition of the said land.

3. A plan of the said land can be inspected at the office of the said the Land Acquisition Officer, PWD (Cell), Altinho, Panaji-Goa till the award is made under Section 11.

#### SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

*Taluka:* Ponda

*Village:* Shiroda

Survey No./ Sub-Div. No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approx. area in sq. mts.
1	2	3
654/1 part O:	Vishwanath Raghuvir Sinai Hede.	1317

1	2	3
655/1 part	O: Vishwanath Raghuvir Sinai Hede.	792
656/1 part	O: Comunidade of Shiroda. T: Jaiwant R. Dhond.	240
657/4 part	O: Comunidade of Shiroda.	163
677/1 part	O: Quistodio Philip Duarto.	390
639/1 part	O: Rajininath Srikant Shirodkar. Lawrence Augustine D'Costa.	913
673/1 part	O: Dhananjay Shankar Prabhu. Pandurang Sadashiv Prabhu. Ketan Vassant Prabhu. Venkatesh Shaba Prabhu.	2545
671/1 part	O: Dhananjay Shankar Prabhu. Pandurang Sadashiv Prabhu. Ketan Vassant Prabhu. Venkatesh Shaba Prabhu.	390
676/1 part	O: Dhananjay Shankar Prabhu. Pandurang Sadashiv Prabhu. Ketan Vassant Prabhu. Venkatesh Shaba Prabhu.	542
670/2 part	O: Quistodio Philip Duarto.	284
679/1 Part	O: Gautam Vishwanath Parkar. Datta Laxman Kungalkar. Joao Antanio Constancio Duarte. Pedro Anastasio Duarte. Andre Duarte. Ana Maria Futado alias Ana Maria Duarte. Jose Constancio Duarte. Joaquim Santa Duarte. Natalia Bernadina Sebastiana Clarina Duarte. Ilda Dharto. Vasanth Baburai Gaunkar. Deepak Rohidas Chopdekar. Prakash Datta Bibalkar.	1826
398/6 part	O: Vishwanath R. S. Hedo.	80

*Boundaries :*

North : Road, S. No. 631/1, 650/3, 398/6, 677/4.

South : Road, S. No. 639/1, 673/1.

1	2	3
East	: S. No. 671, 670/2, 679, 654, 656, 679/1, 673/1, Road.	
West	: Road, S. No. 673/1, 676/1, 655, 639/1, 679/1, 3, 398/1, 677/1.	
		Total: 9482

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*D. M. Redkar*, Under Secretary (Revenue-I).

Porvorim, 24th December, 2009.

**Notification**

No. 22/21/2009-RD

Whereas it appears to the Government of Goa (hereinafter referred to as "the Government") that the land specified in the Schedule hereto (hereinafter referred to as the "said land") is likely to be needed for public purpose, viz. Land Acquisition for playground and for school physical activities to the existing Government Primary School at Akhada at St. Estevam in Tiswadi Taluka.

Now, therefore, the Government hereby notifies under sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Central Act 1 of 1894) (hereinafter referred to as "the said Act") that said land is likely to be needed for the purpose specified above.

2. All persons interested in the said land are hereby warned not to obstruct or interfere with any surveyor or other persons employed upon the said land for the purpose of the said acquisition. Any contract for the disposal of the said land by sale, lease, mortgage, assignment, exchange or otherwise or any outlay commenced or improvements made thereon without the sanction of the Collector appointed under paragraph 4 below, after the date of the publication of this notification, will under clause (seventh) of Section 24 of the said Act be disregarded by him while assessing compensation for such parts of the said land as may be finally acquired.

3. If the Government is satisfied that the said land is needed for the aforesaid purpose, a declaration to that effect under Section 6 of the

said Act will be published in the Official Gazette and in two daily newspapers and public notice thereof shall be given in due course. If the acquisition is abandoned wholly or in part, the fact will also be notified in the same manner.

4. The Government further appoints under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act, the Dy. Collector (LA), Collectorate of North Goa District, Panaji to perform the functions of a Collector, North Goa District, Panaji, under the said Act in respect of the said land.

5. The Government also authorizes under sub-section (2) of Section 4 of the said Act, the following Officers to do the acts, specified therein in respect of the said land.

1. The Collector, North Goa District, Panaji-Goa.
2. The Dy. Collector (LA), Collectorate of North Goa District Panaji-Goa.
3. The Director, Directorate of Education Panaji-Goa.
4. The Director of Settlement and Land Records, Panaji-Goa.

6. A rough plan of the said land is available for inspection in the Office of the Dy. Collector (LA), Collectorate of Nouth Goa, Panaji-Goa, for a period of 30 days from the date of publication of this Notification in the Official Gazette.

#### SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

Taluka: Tiswadi		Village: Jua
Survey No./ Sub-Div. No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3
236 1 part	1. Sadashiv Vithal Walvaikar. 2. Dattaram Vithal Phadte. 3. Atchut Gopal Poi Raiturkar. 4. Shrikant T. Shet. 5. Dnyaneshwar T. Shet. 6. Umakant T. Shet. 7. Amrutrao B. Phadke. 8. Anil Shamba Tari. 9. Jaikumar Anant Kubal. 10. Ishwar Anant Kubal. 11. Jaipal Anant Kubal.	2250

1	2	3
	12. Subhash Pundalik Phadke. (300 sq. mts.)	
236 2	Atchut Gopal Poi Raiturkar.	75
236 3	Atchut Gopal Poi Raiturkar.	175

#### Boundaries :

North : S. No. 236/1.

South : S. No. 236/1.

East : S. No. 236/1.

West : S. No. 236/1.

Total: 2500

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*D. M. Redkar*, Under Secretary (Revenue-I).

Porvorim, 1st January, 2010.

Officer of the Collector & District Election Officer,  
North Goa District

#### Corrigendum

No. 3-1-2009/ELEC/Col/GSVC

Read: Corrigendum No. 3-1-2009/ELEC/Col/  
/GSVC dated 18-12-2009.

In the Corrigendum referred to above, the time "at 4.00 p.m." may be read as "not later than 4.00 p.m."

*R. Mihir Vardhan*, Collector/Ro Goa State  
Veterinary Council, North-Goa.

Panaji, 24th December, 2009.

Department of Water Resources  
Office of the Chief Engineer

#### Order

No. 22-1-81/CE-WR/Adm.II/925

Read: 1. This Office Order No. 22-1-81/CE-WR/  
/Adm.II/743 dated 12-12-2005.

2. Order No. 22-1-81/CE-WR/Adm.II/633  
dated 23-10-2008.

Government is pleased to extend the deputation of Shri S. I. Pattan, Executive Engineer in District Rural Development Agency, North Goa District, Panaji, for further period of six months i.e. from dated 14-06-2009 to 13-12-2009 on the same terms and conditions laid down in Govt. O.M.

No. 13-4-74-PER dated 12-2-1999 from the Department of Personnel, Secretariat, Porvorim and as amended from time to time.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*S. T. Nadkarni*, Chief Engineer (WR) & ex officio Addl. Secretary.

Panaji, 29th December, 2009.

-----  
**Order**

No. 74-1-82/CE-WR/Adm.II/936

Government is pleased to transfer the following Officers of this Department, in public interest.

Sr. No.	Name & designation	Office where presently working	Posted on transfer to
1	2	3	4
1.	Shri R. R. Yaragatti, Engineering Officer	Office of the Chief Engineer, W.R.D. Panaji	Works Div. X, WRD Pajimol, Sanguem, in the existing vacancy of Executive Engineer.

1	2	3	4
2.	Shri Maladkar G. V., Surveyor of Works-II	Office of the Superintending Engineer, C.P.O., WRD, Panaji	Office of the Chief Engineer WRD, Panaji as Engineering Officer.

The concerned Head of Office should relieve the above transferee immediately and copy of the same be endorsed of this office.

Shri Maladkar G. V., Engineering Officer shall also hold the additional charge of Surveyor of Works-II, C. P. O., W.R.D. and Executive Engineer G.T.D.C. Panaji, until further orders.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*S. T. Nadkarni*, Chief Engineer (WR) & ex officio Addl. Secretary.

Panaji, 31st December, 2009.

[www.goagovt.nic.in/gazette.htm](http://www.goagovt.nic.in/gazette.htm)

Published and Printed by the Director, Printing & Stationery,  
Government Printing Press,  
Mahatma Gandhi Road, Panaji-Goa 403 001.

PRICE—Rs. 28.00